arXiv:1604.07586v1 [math.FA] 26 Apr 2016

ENCLOSURE OF THE NUMERICAL RANGE OF A CLASS OF NON-SELFADJOINT RATIONAL OPERATOR FUNCTIONS

CHRISTIAN ENGSTRÖM AND AXEL TORSHAGE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce an enclosure of the numerical range of a class of rational operator functions. In contrary to the numerical range the presented enclosure can be computed exactly in the infinite dimensional case as well as in the finite dimensional case. Moreover, the new enclosure is optimal and many characteristics of the numerical range can be obtained by investigating the enclosure. We introduce a pseudonumerical range and study an enclosure of this set. This enclosure provides a computable upper bound of the norm of the resolvent.

1. INTRODUCTION

The spectral properties of operator functions play an important role in mathematical analysis and in numerous of applications [Tre08, Lif89, APT02]. A classical tool to enclose the point spectrum is the numerical range and the closure of this set will under some conditions also enclose the essential spectrum but it is in most cases not possible to analytically determine the numerical range of an operator. Geometric properties of the numerical range of matrix polynomials and rational matrix functions were studied extensively [LR94, AMP02] and it is possible to numerically determine the shape of the numerical range of matrix polynomials [CNP02]. However, for high-dimensional matrix functions, for example generated by a discretization of a differential equation, the available algorithms are very time consuming.

In this paper we introduce an enclosure of the numerical range of a class of rational operator functions whose values are linear operators in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The new enclosure is applicable in the infinite dimensional case as well as in the finite dimensional case. Let A and B be selfadjoint operators in $\mathcal{H}$, where B is non-zero and bounded. We consider rational operator functions of the form

$$T(\omega) := A - \omega^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c - id\omega - \omega^2} B, \quad \operatorname{dom} T(\omega) = \operatorname{dom} A, \quad \omega \in \mathcal{C}, \tag{1.1}$$

where c and d are non-negative real numbers. For $d = 0$ the operator function $\omega^2 \mapsto T(\omega^2)$ is selfadjoint. This function was studied intensively [FM91, AL95, ALL01, EL04] and in the case $B \geqslant 0$ the rational function is the first Schur complement of a selfadjoint block operator matrix [AL95, Tre08]. The non-selfadjoint case $d > 0$ (as well as the case $d = 0$) has applications in electromagnetic field theory and cover important applications in optics [Zio03, EKE12]. The presented enclosure of the

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47J10, 47A56, 47A12.

Key words and phrases. Non-linear spectral problem, numerical range, psedospectra, resolvent estimate.

numerical range can be computed exactly and is optimal given only the numerical ranges of A and of B.

Resolvent estimates and pseudospectra are used to investigate quantitative properties of non-normal operators and operator functions [Dav07, TE05]. Estimates for the resolvent of general bounded analytic operator functions was considered in [MM01]. In order to derive a computable estimate for (1.1), we introduce a pseudonumerical range and study an enclosure of this set. The derived enclosure of the pseudonumerical range provides a computable upper bound of the norm of the resolvent in the complement of the new enclosure of the numerical range. The enclosure of the pseudospectra can be used to understand how the resolvent behaves outside the enclosure of the numerical range. Moreover, the enclosure of the pseudospectra shows where the resolvent potentially is large and can in the finite dimensional case be combined with a numerical estimate of the pseudospectra [TE05].

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we present the enclosure of the numerical range, the theoretical framework used in the paper, and conditions for determining if $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ belongs to the enclosure.

In Section 3, properties of the boundary of the enclosure is analyzed in detail. The presented results include location of local and global extreme points and determination whether a spectral gap in the form of a strip exists.

In Section 4, the ϵ-pseudonumerical range is introduced and we determine an enclosure of this set. Finally, the enclosures of the ϵ-pseudonumerical ranges is used to compute an upper estimate of the resolvent of (1.1).

Throughout this paper, we use the following notations. Let $\omega_{\Re}$ and $\omega_{\Im}$ denote, respectively, the real and imaginary parts of ω. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a subset of an Euclidean space, then $\partial\mathcal{M}$ denote the boundary of $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\sqrt{\cdot}$ denote the principal square root.

2. Enclosure of the numerical range

In this section we derive an enclosure of the numerical range of the operator function (1.1). Define for the non-negative real number c and positive d the constants

$$\theta := \sqrt{c - \frac{d^2}{4}}, \qquad \delta_\pm := \pm\theta - i\frac{d}{2}. \tag{2.1}$$

Then, the operator-valued function (1.1) is defined for $\omega \in \mathcal{C} := \mathbb{C}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_-\}$, where δ_+ and δ_- are the poles of T. Define for $u \in \operatorname{dom} T(\omega)\backslash\{0\} = \operatorname{dom} A\backslash\{0\}$ the functionals $\alpha_u = (Au,u)/(u,u)$, $\beta_u = (Bu,u)/(u,u)$, and

$$t_{(\alpha_u,\beta_u)}(\omega) := \frac{(T(\omega)u,u)}{(u,u)} = \alpha_u - \omega^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c - id\omega - \omega^2}\beta_u, \quad \omega \in \mathcal{C}. \tag{2.2}$$

The numerical range of T can then be written in the form

$$W(T) := \bigcup_{u\in\operatorname{dom} A\backslash\{0\}} \{\omega \in \mathcal{C} : t_{(\alpha_u,\beta_u)}(\omega) = 0\}.$$

To simplify the investigation of $W(T)$ we define the polynomial

$$p_{(\alpha_u,\beta_u)}(\omega) := t_{(\alpha_u,\beta_u)}(\omega)(c - id\omega - \omega^2) = (\alpha_u - \omega^2)(c - id\omega - \omega^2) - \beta_u\omega^2. \tag{2.3}$$

For fixed values on the constants c, d the roots $r_n : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$, $n = 1, \ldots, 4$ of p_u can be chosen to be continuous functions of the functionals $(\alpha_u, \beta_u) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The numerical range of T can then be written as

$$W(T) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{4} \bigcup_{u \in \operatorname{dom} A \setminus \{0\}} r_n(\alpha_u, \beta_u) \setminus \{\delta_+, \delta_-\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Let $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ denote the extended line of real numbers and set

$$\Omega := W(A) \times W(B) \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.5}$$

Let $\overline{\mathbb{C}} := \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be the Riemann sphere and extend the functions r_n, $n = 1, \ldots, 4$ to $r_n : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the extension coincides with the limit values. The roots r_n are given by particular pairs $(\alpha_u, \beta_u) \in \Omega$ and we obtain an enclosure $W_a(T) \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of the numerical range as

$$\overline{W(T)} \subset W_a(T) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{4} r_n(\Omega), \quad r_n(\Omega) := \bigcup_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} r_n(\alpha, \beta). \tag{2.6}$$

In the following we drop the index u and write $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)$, since $r_n(\alpha, \beta)$ in (2.6) are the roots of (2.3) independent of u.

Lemma 2.1. *The polynomial $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ defined in* (2.3) *has in the limit $\alpha \to \pm\infty$ the roots δ_+, δ_-, ∞, where ∞ is a double root .*

Proof. The roots of (2.3) will coincide with those of

$$\frac{p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)}{\alpha} = p_2(\omega) + \omega^2 \frac{\beta - p_2(\omega)}{\alpha}, \text{ where } p_2(\omega) = (\omega - \delta_+)(\omega - \delta_-). \tag{2.7}$$

The poles δ_+ and δ_- are roots of p_2 and (2.7) is for large $|\alpha|$ a small perturbation of p_2. Then, since the roots of a polynomial depend continuously on its coefficients, δ_+ and δ_- are roots in the limit $\alpha \to \pm\infty$. There can be no other finite roots in the limit since the perturbation of p_2 is arbitrary small. □

Proposition 2.2. *The enclosure $W_a(T)$ has the following properties:*

i) *$W_a(T)$ is symmetric with respect to the imaginary axis.*
ii) *$0 \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $0 \in W(A)$ or $c = 0$.*
iii) *$\delta_+ \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $W(A)$ is unbounded, $0 \in W(B)$ or $c = 0$.*
iv) *$\delta_- \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $W(A)$ is unbounded, or $0 \in W(B)$.*
v) *$\infty \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $W(A)$ is unbounded.*

Proof. i) The polynomial $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(i\omega)$ has real coefficients. Hence, the symmetry follows from the complex conjugate root theorem. ii) Follows directly from (2.3), (2.6). iii) $c = 0$ implies $\delta_+ = 0$ and $\delta_+ \in W_a(T)$ then follows from ii). The number $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\delta_+) = \beta\delta_+^2$ is zero for $\beta = 0$, which implies $\delta_+ \in W_a(T)$ if $0 \in W(B)$. If $W(A)$ is unbounded the statement follows directly from Lemma 2.1. Suppose none of the above holds, then $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\delta_+) = \beta\delta_+^2 \neq 0$, and since $W(A)$ is bounded $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega) \neq 0$ in a neighbourhood of δ_+. The proof of iv) is similar to iii) with the difference $\delta_- \neq 0$ for $c = 0$. v) is immediate from Lemma 2.1. □

Corollary 2.3. *If $\omega \in \{0, \delta_+, \delta_-, \infty\}$, then $\omega \in W_a(T)$ if and only if for some $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \partial\Omega$ we have $r_n(\alpha, \beta) = \omega$.*

Proof. Similar to Proposition 2.2. □

The following propositions provide simple tests for $\omega \in W_a(T)$.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume $\omega = i\omega_\Im \in i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0, \delta_+, \delta_-\}$. Then $\omega \in W_a(T)$ if and only if at least one of following conditions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned} -\omega_\Im^2 - \tfrac{\omega_\Im^2}{c+d\omega_\Im+\omega_\Im^2} W_{\min}(B) \in W(A), \\ -\omega_\Im^2 - \tfrac{\omega_\Im^2}{c+d\omega_\Im+\omega_\Im^2} W_{\max}(B) \in W(A), \\ -(W_{\min}(A) + \omega_\Im^2)\tfrac{c+d\omega_\Im+\omega_\Im^2}{\omega_\Im^2} \in W(B). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. From definition $i\omega_\Im \in W_a(T) \cap i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0, \delta_+, \delta_-\}$ if and only if there exists $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega$ such that

$$\alpha = -\omega_\Im^2 - \frac{\omega_\Im^2}{c + d\omega_\Im + \omega_\Im^2}\beta. \tag{2.9}$$

Thus α is a non-constant real linear function in β. Since $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega$ and β belongs to a bounded set, $r_n(\alpha', \beta') = i\omega_\Im$ for some pair $(\alpha', \beta') \in \partial\Omega$. Equation (2.9) has two solutions unless the pair is a corner of Ω. Hence it is enough to investigate three of the line segments on $\partial\Omega$ to determine if $i\omega_\Im \in W_a(T)$. The converse holds trivially. □

Define the open disc

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{\omega : \left|\omega + i\frac{c}{d}\right| < \frac{c}{d}\right\} \subset \mathbb{C}. \tag{2.10}$$

Lemma 2.5. $\partial\mathcal{D} \cap W_a(T) \subset \{0, \delta_+, \delta_-, -2ic/d\}$

Proof. Assume $\omega \in \partial\mathcal{D}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_-\} \cap W_a(T)$. Then the imaginary part of $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)$ is $-2\omega_\Re\omega_\Im$, which is zero only for $\omega \in \{0, -2ic/d\}$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Assume $\omega \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(i\mathbb{R} \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-, \infty\})$. Then $\omega \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $\omega \notin \partial\mathcal{D}$ and*

$$\hat\beta(\omega) := \frac{-2\omega_\Im\left((-\omega_\Re^2 + \omega_\Im^2 + d\omega_\Im + c)^2 + \omega_\Re^2(2\omega_\Im + d)^2\right)}{d|\omega|^2 + 2c\omega_\Im} \in W(B), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\hat\alpha(\omega) := \frac{(2\omega_\Im + d)|\omega|^4}{d|\omega|^2 + 2c\omega_\Im} \in W(A). \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. Assume $\omega \in W_a(T)$ for some $\omega \notin i\mathbb{R}\cup\{\delta_+, \delta_-\}$. Then, the real and imaginary parts of the equality $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega) = 0$ yields the linear system of equations:

$$-2\omega_\Im\left((-\omega_\Re^2 + \omega_\Im^2 + d\omega_\Im + c)^2 + \omega_\Re^2(2\omega_\Im + d)^2\right) = (d|\omega|^2 + 2c\omega_\Im)\beta, \tag{2.13}$$

$$(2\omega_\Im + d)|\omega|^4 = (d|\omega|^2 + 2c\omega_\Im)\alpha. \tag{2.14}$$

The expression $d|\omega|^2 + 2c\omega_\Im$ is only zero for $\omega \in \partial\mathcal{D}$. Hence (2.11) and (2.12) follows from (2.13), (2.14), and Lemma 2.5. □

Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\beta &:= \{\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\overline{\mathcal{D}} : \omega_\Im \leqslant 0\}, \\ \Pi_\alpha &:= \{\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\overline{\mathcal{D}} : \omega_\Im \geqslant -d/2\} \cup \{\omega \in \mathcal{D} : \omega_\Im \leqslant -d/2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Corollary 2.7 iii) - iv) shows where in the complex plane $W_a(T)$ is located depending on the sign of $\hat\alpha(\omega)$ and $\hat\beta(\omega)$ as defined in Proposition 2.6.

Corollary 2.7.

i) *If $\omega \notin i\mathbb{R}$, then $\omega \notin W_a(T)$ if $|\omega_{\Im}|$ is large enough.*
ii) *For sequences $\{\omega^n\} \in W_a(T)$, with $|\omega^n_{\Re}| \to \infty$, $n \to \infty$, $\hat{\beta}(\omega^n) \sim -2\omega^n_{\Im}\left(\omega^n_{\Re}\right)^2/d$ and $\omega^n_{\Im} = O((\omega^n_{\Re})^{-2})$*
iii) *If $\omega \notin i\mathbb{R} \cup \partial\mathcal{D}$ then $\beta(\omega) \geqslant 0$ if and only if $\omega \in \Pi_\beta$.*
iv) *If $\omega \notin i\mathbb{R} \cup \partial\mathcal{D}$ then $\alpha(\omega) \geqslant 0$ if and only if $\omega \in \Pi_\alpha$.*

Proof. i) The value $|\hat{\beta}(\omega)|$ gets arbitrary large as $\omega_{\Im} \to \pm\infty$ but $W(B)$ is bounded. ii) Assume $\{\omega^n\} \in W_a(T)$, $|\omega^n_{\Re}| \to \infty$, then i) implies that $\omega^n_{\Im}$ is bounded and $\hat{\beta}(\omega^n) \sim -2\omega^n_{\Im}\left(\omega^n_{\Re}\right)^2/d$ from (2.13). Hence, the boundedness of $\hat{\beta}(\omega^n)$ yields that $\omega^n_{\Im} = O((\omega^n_{\Re})^{-2})$. iii) and iv) follows by straightforward calculations. □

The following Lemma and Lemma 2.15 show that $\overline{\gamma \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has finite number of self-intersecations.

Lemma 2.8.

i) *For $\omega \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \backslash (i\mathbb{R} \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-, \infty\})$ there is a unique pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $r_n(\alpha, \beta) = \omega$ for some $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Further if $r_m(\alpha, \beta) = \omega$, $m \neq n$, then $\alpha = c$, $\beta = d^2/4$, and $\omega = \pm\sqrt{c - d^2/16} - id/2$.*
ii) *For given $\omega \in i\mathbb{R} \backslash \{\delta_+, \delta_-\}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ there is an unique $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r_n(\alpha, \beta) = \omega$ for some $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*
iii) *For given $\omega \in i\mathbb{R} \backslash \{0\}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ there is an unique $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r_n(\alpha, \beta) = \omega$ for some $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

Proof. i) Proposition 2.6 yields that $\omega \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $(\hat{\alpha}(\omega), \hat{\beta}(\omega)) \in \Omega$, thus only for $(\alpha, \beta) = (\hat{\alpha}(\omega), \hat{\beta}(\omega))$ can $r_m(\alpha, \beta)$ equal ω. Assume $\omega = r_n(\alpha, \beta) = r_m(\alpha, \beta)$, $n \neq m$. Then, $-\overline{\omega}$ is also a double root since $\omega \notin i\mathbb{R}$ and roots of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ are symmetric with respect to the imaginary axis. The result is then obtained using an ansatz with these two double roots. ii) Fix $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that $\omega = r_n(\alpha, \beta)$ is a root of $p_{(\cdot,\beta)}$ for α and for α'. Then $0 = (\alpha - \alpha')(c - id\omega - \omega^2)$ and thus $\alpha = \alpha'$. iii) The proof is similarly to ii). □

Define the set

$$\gamma := \bigcup_{n=1}^{4} r_n(\partial\Omega). \tag{2.16}$$

Theorem 2.9. *The set γ has the following properties:*

i) $W_a(T) \cap i\mathbb{R} = \gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$
ii) $\partial W_a(T) \backslash i\mathbb{R} = \gamma \backslash i\mathbb{R}$

Proof. i) The inclusion $W_a(T) \cap i\mathbb{R} \supset \gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$ is clear from definition. Let $\omega \in W_a(T) \cap i\mathbb{R}$, then the result follows from Corollary 2.3 and Proposition 2.4. ii) Assume $\delta_+ \in W_a(T) \backslash i\mathbb{R}$, then $\delta_+ \in \partial W_a(T)$ follows from Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.3 implies $\delta_+ \in \gamma$. The proof for δ_- is similar and for ∞ the result follows directly. Apart from $i\mathbb{R} \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-, \infty\}$, Lemma 2.8 i) yields that $r_n : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ is injective. Hence, a consequence of the invariance of domain theorem [Bro12] is that $\partial r_n(\Omega) \backslash i\mathbb{R} = r_n(\partial\Omega) \backslash i\mathbb{R}$, which implies $\partial W_a(T) \backslash \subset \gamma \backslash i\mathbb{R}$ and ii) then follows from Lemma 2.8. □

Corollary 2.10. *The boundary of $\overline{W_a(T) \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is $\overline{\gamma \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$.*

Definition 2.11. Let $\mathcal{N} := \varnothing$ for $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ and $\mathcal{N} := [\delta_-, \delta_+]$ for $d \geqslant 2\sqrt{c}$. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau_1 := \{W_{\min}(A), W_{\min}(B)\} \cup \{W_{\max}(A), W_{\max}(B)\},\\
&\tau_2 := \{W_{\min}(A), W_{\max}(B)\} \cup \{W_{\max}(A), W_{\min}(B)\},\\
&\mathcal{R}_1 := \Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^4 r_n(\tau_1)\Big) \cap i\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{N}, \quad \mathcal{R}_2 := \Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^4 r_n(\tau_2)\Big) \cap \mathcal{N},
\end{aligned}$$

and the counting function $m : \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2 \to \mathbb{N}$, where for $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_j$, we set

$$m(i\mu) := \sum_{n=1}^4 \#\{\tau \in \tau_j \,:\, r_n(\tau) = i\mu\}.$$

Due to continuity, $\cup_n r_n(-\infty, \beta) = \{\delta_\pm, \pm i\infty\}$ and $\cup_n r_n(\infty, \beta) = \{\delta_\pm, \pm\infty\}$.

Proposition 2.12. *Assume $c > 0$, then $i\mu \in \gamma$ is an endpoint of a line segment of $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$ if and only if $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2$ and $m(i\mu)$ is odd. Further if $i\mu$ is an isolated point of $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$ then $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2$ and $m(i\mu)$ is even.*

Proof. The result is first showed for $i\mu \notin \{0, \delta_+, \delta_-, \pm i\infty\}$. Assume $i\mu \notin \mathcal{N} \cup \{0, \pm i\infty\}$ is an endpoint of a line segment or isolated point of $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$. Then for some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \partial\Omega$,

$$\alpha + \mu^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{c + d\mu + \mu^2}\beta = 0.$$

Assume that $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \tau_1$, then since $\frac{\mu^2}{c+d\mu+\mu^2} > 0$ it follows by similar arguments as given in Proposition 2.4 that there exist $(\alpha', \beta') \in \Omega\backslash\partial\Omega$ such that $\alpha' + \mu^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{c+d\mu+\mu^2}\beta' = 0$. Then, Lemma 2.8 ii)-iii) gives a contradiction. Hence $(\alpha, \beta) \in \tau_1$ and $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1$. Assume $i\mu$ is a isolated point, then from the roots symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis it follows that $m(i\mu)$ is even. Assume that $i\mu$ is endpoint of a line segment then from injectivity given by Lemma 2.8 ii)-iii) exactly one root must follow the line segment. Thus from the roots symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis it follows that $m(i\mu)$ is odd.

If $i\mu \in \mathcal{N}\backslash\{0, \delta_+, \delta_-\}$ similar argument gives the result for $\mathcal{R}_2$. For the converse assume $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $m(i\mu)$ odd. Then since $\frac{\mu^2}{c+d\mu+\mu^2} > 0$ it follows that $i\mu$ is the root for an unique pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \tau_1$. Assume that $i\mu$ is not the endpoint of a line segment, then since it is not an isolated point it must be inside a line segment. From injectivity given by Lemma 2.8 ii)-iii), symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis, and that $m(i\mu)$ is odd, it follows that for $(\alpha', \beta') \in \partial\Omega$ sufficiently close to (α, β) there is exactly one simple root on the imaginary axis that is in the vicinity of $i\mu$. Choose points $i\mu_1$, $i\mu_2$ in the vicinity of $i\mu$ such that, $\mu_1 < \mu < \mu_2$ and $\frac{\mu_i^2}{c+d\mu_i+\mu_i^2} > 0$. Then there is some (α_1, β_1), $(\alpha_2, \beta_2) \in \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\alpha_1 + \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{c + d\mu_1 + \mu_1^2}\beta_1 = 0, \quad \alpha_2 + \mu_2^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{c + d\mu_2 + \mu_2^2}\beta_2 = 0.$$

Since $\frac{\mu_i^2}{c+d\mu_i+\mu_i^2} > 0$ there is a line of solutions (α, β) intersecting $\partial\Omega$ twice. Hence we can assume that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$. By continuity there must exist a β_3 between β_1 and β_2 such that (α, β_3) have the root $i\mu$. But $\beta_3 \neq \beta$ which contradicts Lemma 2.8 iii). The proof for $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_2$ and $m(i\mu)$ odd is similar. Assume $i\mu \in \{0, \delta_+, \delta_-\}$, then the result is shown by investing each case for $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2$ and when $i\mu$ is an endpoint of a line segment of $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$. □

Remark 2.13. If $c = 0$, $\mu = 0$ is always a solution to (2.3) and a similar results as in Proposition 2.12 can be obtained from the reduced cubic polynomial and by adding a single point at zero if it is not included in one of the other segments.

Proposition 2.14. *$\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2$ by the following algorithm:*

1. *Set $\mathcal{I} := \{i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2 : m(i\mu)$ is odd$\}$ and enumerate $\mu \in \mathcal{I}$ increasingly $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots$.*
2. *Add an interval between $i\mu_j, i\mu_{j+1}$ in $\mathcal{I}$ if j is odd.*
3. *Set $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R} = \mathcal{I} \cup (\mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2)$.*

Proof. From Proposition 2.12 it follows that step 1 defines $\mathcal{I}$ as the set of endpoints of line segments of $i\mu \in \mathcal{R}_1 \dot\cup \mathcal{R}_2$, where $i\mu_1$ is a local minimum. Then $i\mu_2$ must be the endpoint of that segment, hence a local maximum. Doing this iteratively gives that for all odd j, $i\mu_j$ is a local minimum and for even j, $i\mu_j$ is a local maximum. Hence, step 2 sets $\mathcal{I}$ to $\gamma \cap i\mathbb{R}$ apart from isolated points. These are added in step 3. □

The following Lemma and Lemma 2.8 implies that $\overline{\gamma \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has finite number of self-intersections.

Lemma 2.15.

i) *Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, then $p_{(\alpha,\cdot)}$ has a multiple root for at most 4 values $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.*
ii) *Fix $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, then $p_{(\cdot,\beta)}$ has a multiple root for at most 5 values $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.*
iii) *$p_{(0,\beta)}$ has a double root at 0 and the roots $\pm\sqrt{\beta + c - d^2/4} - id/2$.*
iv) *$p_{(\alpha,0)}$ has the roots $\pm\sqrt{\alpha}$ and $\pm\sqrt{c - d^2/4} - id/2$.*

Proof. If $\alpha = 0$ or both $\beta = 0$ and $d = 2\sqrt{c}$, then discriminant $\Delta_{p_{(\alpha,\beta)}}$ is zero and $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ has a double root. For all other cases, we conclude from definition that $\Delta_{p_{(\alpha,\beta)}}$ is a fifth-degree polynomial in α and a fourth-degree polynomial in β. □

Definition 2.16. Two disjoint sets $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ are neighbors if $\partial\Gamma_1 \cap \partial\Gamma_2$ contains at least one curve segment.

The algorithm presented in Proposition 2.17 is described in Figure 1.

Proposition 2.17. *$\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}} = \overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if $W(A)$ or $W(B)$ constant. Otherwise $\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is obtained from $\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ by the following algorithm:*

1. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the connected component of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ containing values of ω with arbitrarily large imaginary parts.*
2. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ be the union of all connected components that are neighbours of $\mathcal{O}$.*
3. *Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ be the union of all connected components that are neighbours of $\mathcal{I}$.*
4. *If $\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{O} \neq \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$, go to step 2*
5. *Set $\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{I} \cup \overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$.*

Proof. If $W(A)$ or $W(B)$ are constant the result follows by definition. Corollary 2.7 shows that only one component of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ contains values of ω with arbitrarily large imaginary parts. Hence the initial set $\mathcal{O} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ in Step 1 is well defined. From from Lemmata 2.8 and 2.15 it follows that $\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has a finite number of self-intersections and by definition γ has at most 4 components. Hence, $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ consist of finite number of components, which implies that the algorithm



FIGURE 1. Visualization of how $\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is obtained from γ using the algorithm presented in Proposition 2.17. Red and blue denotes points given by $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$ and $\alpha \in [-\infty, 0)$, respectively.

will terminate after finite number of steps. Corollary 2.10 yields that the set $\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is the boundary of a closed set and if two component of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash(\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}})$ are neighbours one is a subset of $\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ and one is a subset of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. Thus if $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ are determined by the algorithm, $\mathcal{I} \subset \overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathcal{O} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}\backslash\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. Together with the termination criteria this yields the Proposition. □

Remark 2.18. This problem is equivalent to 2-colorability of the dual graph of $\overline{\gamma\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. [SK86, Theorem 2-3].

3. Analysis of the enclosure of the numerical range

The function $\tilde{T}(\lambda) := -T(\sqrt{\lambda})$ is analytic in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+$ and

$$\Im(\tilde{T}(\lambda)u, u) \geqslant 0, \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+$$

if and only if $W_{\min}(B) \geqslant 0$. Hence, $\tilde{T}$ is a Nevanlinna function if and only if $W_{\min}(B) \geqslant 0$. Since operator functions with applications in physics often are Nevanlinna functions, we analyze in this section the enclosure $\overline{W_a(T)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ under assumption $W_{\min}(B) \geqslant 0$. However, the analysis when $W_{\min}(B)$ is allowed to be negative is similar.

Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4$ be the roots of (2.3) and define

$$it_1 := \omega_1 + \omega_2, \quad it_2 := \omega_3 + \omega_4, \quad v_1 := -\omega_1\omega_2, \quad v_2 := -\omega_3\omega_4. \tag{3.1}$$

From the relation between the coefficients and roots of a polynomial it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 + t_2 &= -d \\ t_1t_2 + v_1 + v_2 &= \alpha + \beta + c \\ t_1v_2 + t_2v_1 &= -\alpha d \\ v_1v_2 &= \alpha c \end{aligned} \quad . \tag{3.2}$$

It is of interest to see when (2.3) has purely imaginary solutions and the following result shows that it depends on the sign of α.

Lemma 3.1.



FIGURE 2. Examples of the set $\gamma_\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, where red and blue denotes points given by $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$ and $\alpha \in [-\infty, 0)$, respectively.

i) *If $\alpha < 0$, (2.3) has least two roots of the form $i\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, exactly one root where $\mu > 0$ and at least one root where $\mu \leqslant 0$ ($\mu < 0$ if $c > 0$).*
ii) *If $\alpha > 0$ then roots to (2.3) of the form $i\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfies $\mu \leqslant 0$ ($\mu < 0$ if $c > 0$). If $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ there are no pure imaginary root and if $d \geqslant 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$ there are at least two purely imaginary roots.*

Proof. i) If $\beta = 0$, the result follows from Lemma 2.15. Assume $\beta > 0$ and μ a root of the real function $\hat{p}$ define by $\hat{p}(\mu) := p_{(\alpha,\beta)}(i\mu)$. Then,

$$\hat{p}(\mu) := (\mu^2 + \alpha)(\mu^2 + d\mu + c) + \beta\mu^2 = 0, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\hat{p}$ is positive and of even order. For $\alpha < 0$ it follows that $\hat{p}(0) \leqslant 0$ (with equality if and only if $c = 0$) and thus there is a positive and a non-positive root (negative if $c > 0$). There can be no other roots $\mu > 0$ since $\hat{p}'(0) = \alpha d < 0$ and $\hat{p}'$ is convex on $[0,\infty)$. Hence $\hat{p}(\mu) = 0$ for exactly one value $\mu > 0$.

ii) If $\alpha > 0$ then $\hat{p}(\mu) > 0$ whenever $\mu > 0$ or $d < 2\sqrt{c}$. Assume $\alpha > 0$, $d \geqslant 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$, then $\hat{p}(-d/2) \leqslant 0$, which implies that $\hat{p}$ has at least two real roots. □

The set γ which determine the enclosure $W_a(T)$, Theorem 2.9, depend on the rectangle $\partial\Omega$. Hence there are two types of curves that are interesting to analyze:

In subsection 3.1, $\beta \in W(B)$ is fixed and in subsection 3.2, $\alpha \in W(A)$ is fixed. Properties of the roots of the polynomial (2.3) is then determined as a function of α and β, respectively.

3.1. **Variation of the numerical range $W(A)$.** In this section, we will in greater detail describe the subset of γ obtained when fixing β and vary $\alpha \in W(A)$. Define for $\beta \in W(B)$ the set γ_β as

$$\gamma_{W(A),\beta} := \bigcup_{n=1}^{4} r_n(W(A) \times \{\beta\}), \quad \gamma_\beta := \gamma_{\overline{\mathbb{R}},\beta}. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that for $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(i\mathbb{R} \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-\})$, $\omega \in \gamma_\beta$ is equivalent to $\beta = \hat{\beta}(\omega)$ in (2.11). The set γ_β, can be parametrized in variable $\alpha \in W(A)$ into a union of four curves. For $\beta = 0$, γ_β is completely characterized by Lemma 2.15 and we will therefore assume $\beta > 0$ in the rest of Section 3.1. Figure 2 illustrates possible behaviors of γ_β.

Proposition 3.2. *For $\beta, c > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\mu = 0$ or μ is a real solution to*

$$q_\beta(\mu) := \mu^4 + 2d\mu^3 + (2c + d^2)\mu^2 + d\left(\frac{\beta}{2} + 2c\right)\mu + c\,(\beta + c) = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

If $c = 0$ then $0 \notin \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ but all other statements hold as for the case $c > 0$.

Proof. Assume $i\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, is a root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ of order greater than one. Hence $i\mu$ has to be at least a double root and we set $t_1 = 2\mu$, $v_1 = \mu^2$ (3.1). The system (3.2) can then be written as

$$\begin{array}{c} 2\mu + t_2 = -d \\ 2\mu t_2 + \mu^2 + v_2 = \alpha + \beta + c \\ 2\mu v_2 + \mu^2 t_2 = -\alpha d \\ \mu^2 v_2 = \alpha c. \end{array} . \tag{3.6}$$

Solving (3.6) shows that μ is a solution if and only if $\mu = 0$ or μ is a root of (3.5). Assume $i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis $i\mu$ is a double root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ for some α. Hence $\mu = 0$ or μ is a real solution to (3.5).

For the converse, assume that one of the poles is purely imaginary and that $i\mu \in \{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ is a root of q_β, then from (3.5) it follows then that $c \in \{0, d^2/4\}$. For $c = d^2/4$ is $\mu = -d/2$ a solution to (3.5). Then in the limit $\alpha \to \infty$, $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = -id/2$ is a root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ but $\overline{p_{(\alpha,\beta)}}$ do not have a purely imaginary root for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, which implies $-i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. For $c = 0$ is $\mu = 0$ a solution to (3.5), and thus a double root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ for some $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Moreover, the origin is a root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Hence, the symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis implies that zero only can belong to the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if for some α, zero is a triple root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$. An anzats with a triple root implies $\beta = 0$, which yields a contradiction. Now assume that $\mu = 0$ or μ is a real solution to (3.5) and $i\mu \notin \{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Then $i\mu$ is a double root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and Lemma 2.8 ii) yields $i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. □

Let Δ_{q_β} denote the discriminant of of q_β.

Corollary 3.3. *The polynomial* (2.3) *has a root $i\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ of multiplicity $n > 1$ for some $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if μ is a root of* (3.5) *of multiplicity $n - 1$.*

Proof. The assumptions on the coefficients imply that q_β can not have an quadruple root. A straightforward calculation shows that $p_{(\cdot,\beta)}$ has a quadruple root $i\mu$ for some α if and only if μ is a triple root of q_β. Assume that $p_{(\cdot,\beta)}$ has a triple root $i\mu$ for some α. From (3.1) and (3.2) follows that this assumption is equivalent to $\Delta_{q_\beta} = 0$. Hence, q_β has a multiple root and the multiplicity must be two. For $n = 2$, we showed that the multiplicity of a root of q_β can not be larger then one. Then the result follows from Proposition 3.2. □

The multiplicity of a real root μ of q_β determine the number of segments of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersecting $i\mu$, (if $c = 0$ there is no intersection in zero). Figure 3 **c** illustrates γ_β for a case with a triple intersection of the imaginary axis. This can only happen when $d = 2\sqrt{\beta} = 4\sqrt{c}$ and $\mu = -d/4$, which implies that all sets γ_β with this property are linear scalings of Figure 3 **c**.

For convenience, we set in Lemma 3.4 some constants to ∞. These constants are used in Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 3.4.

i) *For $\beta < 4c$, $\Delta_{q_\beta} = 0$ has an unique non-negative solution $d_1 \in (0, 2\sqrt{c})$. Set $d_2 = d_3 = \infty$.*



FIGURE 3. Sets $\gamma_\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, where red denotes points given by $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$ and blue $\alpha \in [-\infty, 0)$. In **a** there is a double root of q_β, (3.5), in **b** there are two distinct roots and in **c** there is one distinct root and one triple root.

ii) *For* $4c \leqslant \beta < 8c$, $\Delta_{q_\beta} = 0$ *has the three non-negative solutions* $d_1 \in (0, 2\sqrt{c})$, $d_2 \in (2\sqrt{c}, 2\sqrt{\beta}]$, *and* $d_3 \in [2\sqrt{\beta}, \infty)$.

iii) *For* $\beta \geqslant 8c$, $\Delta_{q_\beta} = 0$ *has two non-negative solutions* $d_1 \in [0, 2\sqrt{c})$, $d_2 \in (2\sqrt{c}, 2\sqrt{\beta}]$. *Set* $d_3 = \infty$. *If* $c = 0$ *we do not count the multiplicity of root* 0.

iv) *The polynomial* q_β *has zero real roots if* $d < d_1$ *and four real roots if* $d_2 \leqslant d \leqslant d_3$, *else it has two real roots.*

Proof. Let $\hat{d} := d^2/4$ and consider $f(\hat{d}) := \Delta_{q_\beta}$ as a polynomial in $\hat{d}$, where each positive root will correspond to exactly one positive solution d. By definition of the discriminant:

$$\frac{f(\hat{d})}{32\beta^2} = (\beta - 8c)\hat{d}^3 - \left(\frac{27}{32}\beta^2 - 6\beta c - 24c^2\right)\hat{d}^2 - 3c^2(5\beta + 8c)\hat{d} + 8c^3(\beta + c). \tag{3.7}$$

For $c = 0$ the roots are 0, $27\beta/32$ and the result follows. If $c > 0$ existence of a root $\hat{d}_1 \in (0, c)$ follows from $f(0) > 0$, $f(c) < 0$. The discriminant of f is $\Delta_f = 2 \cdot 6^9 \beta^{12} c^3 (\beta - 4c)^3$.

i) Assume $\beta < 4c$, then $\Delta_f < 0$ and thus f has only one real root.

ii) Assume $4c \leqslant \beta < 8c$, then $\Delta_f \geqslant 0$ and f is a cubic polynomial. It can be seen that $f(\beta) \geqslant 0$ and $f(\hat{d}) \to -\infty$, $\hat{d} \to \infty$. Hence there is one root $\hat{d}_2$ in $(c, \beta]$ and one root $\hat{d}_3$ in $[\beta, \infty)$.

iii) Assume $\beta \geqslant 8c$. Then $f(\beta) > 0$, thus there is a root $\hat{d}_2$ in $(c, \beta]$. In the special case $\beta = 8c$, f is a quadratic polynomial and thus there are no more roots. Otherwise $\beta > 8c$ and then the last root will be negative.

iv) The sign of f will be negative if and only if $d_1 < d < d_2$ or $d > d_3$ and thus in these cases q_β have two roots, else it will either have zero or four roots. When $d = 0$, q_β has no root and by continuity no roots for $d < d_1$. For $d_2 \leqslant d \leqslant d_3$ it holds that $d > 2\sqrt{c}$ and $q_\beta(-d/2 - \sqrt{d^2/4 - c}) < 0$. Then, since the highest order term of q_β is positive it must have at least one root and thus four roots.

□

Figure 3 **a** and **c** depicts γ_β for $d = d_1$ and $d = d_2 = d_3$, respectively.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $d_k \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $k = 1, 2, 3$ denote the constants defined in Lemma 3.4 and set*

$$I_1 := (-d/2 - \sqrt{2d^2 - 8c})/2, -d/2), \quad I_2 := (-\infty, -d/2 - \sqrt{2d^2 - 8c}/2),$$
$$l_3 := (-d/2 - \sqrt{d^2 - 4c}/2, -d/2), \qquad I_4 := (-\infty, -d/2 - \sqrt{d^2 - 4c}/2).$$

For $c > 0$, the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersects the imaginary axis at zero and in the following points, counting multiplicity:

i) *For $d < 2\sqrt{c}$, there are no intersections if $d < d_1$, else there are two intersections in the interval $(-\infty, -d/2)$.*
ii) *For $d = 2\sqrt{c}$, the two intersections are $-d/2$ and $-(d + \sqrt[3]{4\beta d})/2$.*
iii) *For $2\sqrt{c} < d < 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$ there is one intersection in I_2. If $d_2 \leqslant d \leqslant d_3$ there are three more intersections, else only one more. These intersection are in the interval $(-d/2, 0)$.*
iv) *For $d = 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$, $-d/2$ is an intersection and there is one intersection in the interval I_2. If $d \geqslant d_3$ there are two intersections in the interval $(-d/2, 0)$ else none more.*
v) *For $d > 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$, there is one intersection in I_4, and one in $(-\infty, d/2)\backslash I_4$. If $d \geqslant d_3$ there are two intersections in the interval $(-d/2, 0)$ else none.*

Proof. Assume $c > 0$, then the intersections will coincide with roots of q_β.

i) From Lemma 3.4, iv) follows that there are no intersections when $d \in (0, d_1)$ and two intersections for $d \in [d_1, 2\sqrt{c})$. Since $q_\beta(\mu) > 0$ for $\mu \geqslant -d/2$, $d \in [d_1, 2\sqrt{c})$ the two intersections are in $(-\infty, -d/2)$.

ii) Follows from from straight forward computations.

iii) The value $q_\beta(\mu)$ is negative on $(-\infty, d/2)\backslash I_2$, thus there are no intersections in $(-\infty, d/2)\backslash I_2$. The function q_β is convex on I_2 and $q_\beta(-\infty) > 0$. Hence, there is one intersection in I_2. All other intersections are in $(-d/2, 0)$ and the number of intersections is given by Lemma 3.4, iv).

iv) $q(-d/2) = 0$, everything else follows by the same steps as iii).

v) We have $q(-d/2) > 0$, $q'(\mu) > 0$ for $\mu \in I_3$, and $q(-(d + \sqrt{d^2 - 4c})/2) < 0$, thus one root of q is in I_3. The function q_β is convex on I_4 and $q_\beta(-\infty) > 0$. Hence, there are one intersection in I_4. All other intersections are in $(-d/2, 0)$ and the number of intersections is given by Lemma 3.4, iv). □

Remark 3.6. Results similar to Proposition 3.5 hold also in the case $c = 0$ except the intersections at $\mu = 0$ is false.

Proposition 3.7. *$\omega \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\omega \in \{0, \infty\}$ ($\omega = \infty$ if $c = 0$) or $\omega_\Im \neq 0$ and one of the following four identities hold:*

$$\omega_\Re = \pm\sqrt{P_{\omega_\Im} \pm \sqrt{P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im}} - \omega_\Im^2}, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\omega_\Im} &:= c - \tfrac{d^2}{2} - d\omega_\Im - \tfrac{\beta d}{4\omega_\Im} \\ Q_{\omega_\Im} &:= \beta c + c^2 + 2cd\omega_\Im + 4c\omega_\Im^2 \end{aligned} . \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. From symmetry with respect to the imaginary axis we can choose $t_1 = 2\omega_\Im$ (3.1). The result then follows from straight forward computations using (3.2). □

The system (3.2) can be solved for a given α by solving a fourth order polynomial to find ω. However, Proposition 3.7 shows that if $\omega_\Im$ is known, $\omega_\Re$ can be computed independently of α. This enables us to see $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ as a multivalued function in $\omega_\Im$.

Definition 3.8. A *strip* to a closed set $\Gamma \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\omega \in \mathbb{C} : s_0 < \omega_\Im < s_1\}, \quad \Gamma \cap S = \emptyset, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\Gamma \cap (\mathbb{R} + is_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $\Gamma \cap (\mathbb{R} + is_1) \neq \emptyset$.
Then the set $\Gamma \cap (\mathbb{R} + is_0)$ is called the *local minimum* points and $\Gamma \cap (\mathbb{R} + is_1)$ is the *local maximum* points. The *global minimum (maximum)* is the point with the smallest (largest) imaginary part Γ. The *extreme* points of Γ is the union of the global and local maximum and minimum points.

Figure 2 **c** depicts $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ for a case with a strip $\mathcal{S}$ as defined in (3.10). Note that the global maximum point of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is always zero.

Corollary 3.9. *The global minimum of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is less than $Im(\delta_2)$.*

Proof. The claim follows immediately since it exists an ω with $\omega_\Im = Im(\delta_2), \omega_\Re \neq 0$ satisfying (3.8). □

Lemma 3.10. *A point $\omega \in \gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}$ is an extreme point in the sense of Definition 3.8 if and only if $\omega_\Im$ is a distinct root of $f(\omega_\Im) := \omega_\Im^2(P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im})$. The roots of f are*

$$\text{i)} \quad \omega_\Im = \frac{-d \pm \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta}}{4}, \quad \text{ii)} \quad \omega_\Im = \frac{-d \pm d\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\beta}{4c - d^2}}}{4}. \tag{3.11}$$

A double root of f is only possible if $d = 2\sqrt{\beta} < 4\sqrt{c}$, where $\omega = \pm\sqrt{c - d^2/16} - id/2$. Then, ω is a self-intersection point of $\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By simple computations it follows that the roots of f are (3.11). From Lemma 2.8 i) and Proposition 3.7 it follows that a double root μ of f exists if and only if $\mu = -d/4 = -\sqrt{\beta}/2 < \sqrt{c}$. Then, Proposition 3.7 yields that the corresponding points on γ_β are $\omega = \pm\sqrt{c - d/16} - id/4$. $P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im}$ is non-negative in an neighborhood of $-d/4$, thus it is not an extreme point but an self-intersection.

Assume that $\omega \in \gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}$ is an extreme point and that $f(\omega_\Im) \neq 0$. Then since one of the identities (3.8) holds it follows that $P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im} > 0$. Likewise $P_{\omega_\Im} \pm \sqrt{P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im}} - \omega_\Im^2 > 0$, since $\omega_\Re \neq 0$. The function $P_{\omega_\Im} \pm \sqrt{P_{\omega_\Im}^2 - Q_{\omega_\Im}} - \omega_\Im^2$ is continous in $\omega_\Im$. Hence, there exists an open interval $I_{\omega_\Im}$ containing $\omega_\Im$ such that $P_\mu \pm \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2 > 0$ for each $\mu \in I_{\omega_\Im}$. Then (3.8) holds for any point in the interval, which contradict that ω is an extreme point. Hence it follows that $\omega_\Im$ is a distinct root of f. Now suppose $\omega_\Im$ is a distinct root of f then for every open interval $I_{\omega_\Im}$ containing $\omega_\Im$, there exist an $\mu \in I_{\omega_\Im}$ such that $f(\mu) < 0$, and it is thus an extreme point by identities (3.8). □

Figure 2 **c** shows a case where the local extreme points as well as the global minimum is not on the imaginary axis.

Lemma 3.11. *A point $i\mu \in i\mathbb{R}$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ is an extreme point to $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $0 = P_\mu + \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2$ and μ is a distinct intersection of the imaginary axis.*

Proof. From Proposition 3.2 follows that each intersection of the imaginary axis is equivalent to a root of q_β as defined in (3.5). Assume $i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is an extreme point. Then by Proposition 3.7, $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu \geqslant 0$ and one of the identities $0 = P_\mu \pm \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2$ hold. If $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu = 0$, then by continuity $i\mu$ is for some α a quadruple root of the polynomial $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ defined in (2.3). Hence, by Proposition 3.7 the root can not be an extreme point. Furthermore, Corollary 3.3 implies that μ is a triple root of q_β, thus not distinct. Assume $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu > 0$ and $0 \neq P_\mu + \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.10 that $i\mu \in \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is not an extreme point. Hence, we have shown that $0 = P_\mu + \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2$ and $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu > 0$. Assume μ is not distinct root of q_β, then at least two segments of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersect $i\mu$. Since $P_\mu - \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2 < 0$, Proposition 3.7 implies that in some interval containing μ there is for a given $\omega_\Im$ at most two solutions ω. Combining these results shows that $i\mu$ is not an extreme point and the intersection must then be distinct. Assume $P_\mu + \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2 = 0$ and μ is a distinct root of q_β. Then there is only one segment of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersecting $i\mu$. Furthermore, $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu > 0$ and thus $P_\mu - \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2 < 0$. Proposition 3.7 then implies that $i\mu$ is an extreme point. □

Proposition 3.12. *Every real number is $\omega_\Re$ of some $\omega \in \gamma_\beta$.*

Proof. For $\omega_\Re = \pm\sqrt{c - d^2/4}$ note that $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \gamma_\beta$, else $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega) = 0$ in (2.3), has for fixed $\omega_\Re$ and β a solution for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. □

Lemma 3.13. *For each bounded connected component $\gamma' \subset \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ and $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ either one root of* (2.3) *belongs to γ' or one root of* (2.3) *can be written as $i\mu$, for $\mu \in J := [\min(\gamma' \backslash i\mathbb{R})_\Im, \max(\gamma' \backslash i\mathbb{R})_\Im]$.*

Proof. If the bounded component of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ does not intersect $i\mathbb{R}$ it contains by continuity a root for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. If the bounded component $\gamma' \subset \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersects with $i\mathbb{R}$ the curve is closed with an even number of intersections of the imaginary axis (counting multiplicity in (3.5)). Assume that there is an $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that no root is on γ' or purely imaginary with imaginary part in J. Then, by definition (3.4), $r_n(\alpha, \beta)$ is not on $\gamma' \cup iJ$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$. From the continuity of the roots it follows that there exist an α' such that $r_n(\alpha', \beta) \in \gamma' \cup iJ$ and for a sufficiently small $|\epsilon|$, $r_n(\alpha' + \epsilon, \beta)$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$ is not on $\gamma' \cup iJ$. Since this can only happen on the imaginary axis it follows that (2.3) for α' has a purely imaginary multiple root $i\mu$ on γ'. Thus for some ordering of the roots $r_1(\alpha', \beta) = r_2(\alpha', \beta) = i\mu$. Since $r_1(\alpha' + \epsilon, \beta) \notin \gamma'$ and $r_2(\alpha' + \epsilon, \beta) \notin \gamma'$ it follows by continuity that they are imaginary. By Lemma 2.8 ii) one of the roots has larger imaginary part and one smaller imaginary part than μ. Then if both are outside J, it follows that J will consist of only one point. Hence μ is a double root of (3.5) and from Corollary 3.3, $i\mu$ is a triple root of $p_{(\alpha,\beta)}$. Hence $r_3(\alpha', \beta) = i\mu$ and by injectivity (Lemma 2.8) one root will belong to γ' for $\alpha' + \epsilon$, a contradiction.

□

Definition 3.14. Denote the real roots to (3.5) as

$$\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots \tag{3.12}$$

Proposition 3.15. *Let d_2 denote the constant defined in Lemma 3.4. Then, there is a unique strip $\mathcal{S}$ as defined in* (3.10) *to $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $d > \min(2\sqrt{\beta}, d_2)$, else none.*

Proof. By definition (3.4) the imaginary part of γ_β is bounded and there is a strip if and only if there are at least three extreme points with different imaginary parts (disregarding the global maximum 0).

If $d > 2\sqrt{\beta}$ it follows from Proposition 3.7 that $\omega \notin \overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ for $\omega_\Im = -d/4$ and Corollary 3.9 implies that $-d/4$ is not the global minimum. Hence, there exists a strip containing the set $\mathbb{R} - id/4$.

If $2\sqrt{\beta} \geqslant d > d_2$, it follows that (3.5) has four distinct real roots (if $d_3 = 2\sqrt{\beta}$ it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $d_2 = 2\sqrt{\beta}$ and this contradicts $2\sqrt{\beta} \geqslant d > d_2$). Thus from Corollary 3.3 there are five intersections of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ with the imaginary axis. Assume that the global minimum is not on the imaginary axis. Then it follows from Lemma 3.10 and $d_2 > 2\sqrt{c}$ that the global minimum is larger than $-d/2$, which contradicts Corollary 3.9. Hence the minimum is on the imaginary axis and thus given by the root μ_1, where $P_{\mu_1} + \sqrt{P_{\mu_1}^2 - Q_{\mu_1}} - \mu_1^2 = 0$ by Lemma 3.11. Assume that there is no strip. Then Lemma 3.11 implies $P_\mu + \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2 > 0$, with $P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu \geqslant 0$ for all $\mu \in (\mu_1, 0)$.

Define for $\mu \in (\mu_1, 0)$ the function $f(\mu) := P_\mu - \sqrt{P_\mu^2 - Q_\mu} - \mu^2$. Then Proposition 3.7 implies $f(\mu_i) = 0$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$. Take $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and assume that $f(\mu)$ is either positive or negative in an open punctured interval around μ_i. Then it follows from Corollary 3.3 that μ_i is not a distinct root of q_β. Hence $f(\mu)$ alternates signs between the roots. By Proposition 3.7 there must thus be two bounded components of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. Since $d < 2\sqrt{\beta + c}$, Proposition 3.5 implies $\mu_i > -d/2$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$. Then from Lemma 3.13 it follows that both poles are larger than $-d/2$, which gives a contradiction and a strip must therefore exist.

Assume that there are at least two strips, then there must be at least three components of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$, one is unbounded and two bounded. Lemma 3.13 implies that the bounded components will both enclose a pole. This yields that the poles are imaginary and thus each bounded component intersects the imaginary axis twice and we have four real roots of (3.5). Since the imaginary parts of these roots approach 0 as the real parts approach $\pm\infty$, the points 0 and ∞ will be in the same component with no other intersections of the imaginary axis. This means that for $\alpha \geqslant 0$ there are two roots in the unbounded component. By Lemma 3.13 there are always at least one root on or enclosed by a bounded component. Hence, for $\alpha \geqslant 0$ there is only one root in each bounded component. Thus due to symmetry the roots in the bounded components are imaginary for all $\alpha \geqslant 0$. Hence, if ω belongs to a bounded component of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ then $\omega_\Im \leqslant -d/2$ and thus all the solutions μ to (3.5) satisfies $\mu \leqslant -d/2$, which contradicts Proposition 3.5.

If $d \leqslant \min(2\sqrt{\beta}, d_2)$, it follows that (3.5) has at most 2 distinct roots, μ_1, μ_2. Hence, Lemma 3.10 implies that there can only be one extreme point not on the imaginary axis and only if $d < 2\sqrt{c}$. Assume a strip exists, then $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ must hold. By Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.5 all possible extreme points have imaginary part smaller than $-d/2$, which is the imaginary part of the poles. Hence by Lemma 3.13 there is no strip. □

Figure 4 depicts γ_β and illustrate the claims of Proposition 3.15. The following proposition gives a detailed description of the strip $\mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 3.16.

i) *If $\beta < 4c$ the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has a strip $\mathcal{S}$ as defined in* (3.10) *if and only if $d > 2\sqrt{\beta}$.*
   - *If $d < \frac{\beta+4c}{2\sqrt{c}}$ then the local maximum points are not on the imaginary axis and $s_0 = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$. Else the local maximum point is $i\mu_2$,* (3.12).
   - *The local minimum points are not on the imaginary axis and $s_1 = (-d + \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$.*

ii) *If $\beta \geqslant 4c > 0$ the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has a strip $\mathcal{S}$ if and only if $d_2 < d$.*
   - *The local maximum point is $i\mu_2$.*
   - *If $d \leqslant \frac{\beta+4c}{2\sqrt{c}}$ then the local minimum point is $i\mu_3$. Else the local minimum points are not on the imaginary axis and $s_1 = (-d+\sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$.*

Proof. First show that $s_0 = \mu_2$ if the maximum point is on the imaginary axis and $s_0 = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$ if the maximum is not on the imaginary axis. If a strip exists then it follows from Corollary 2.7 that there is exactly one unbounded component and one bounded component of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. By continuity the bounded component intersects the imaginary axis an even number of times. If the local maximum is on the imaginary axis it must thus be the largest root of the bounded component. Thus the root denoted μ_2 in Definition 3.14 if the bounded component intersects the imaginary axis two times and the root μ_4 if there are four intersections.
Assume there are four intersections with the imaginary axis. This leads to a contradiction by arguments analogous to the proof of the uniqueness of a strip in Proposition 3.15. Thus, the local maximum is $i\mu_2$, similarly it follows that the local minimum is $i\mu_3$.

Assume that the local maximum is not on the imaginary axis. Then $f(s_0) = s_0^2(P_{s_0}^2 - Q_{s_0}) = 0$ from Lemma 3.10 and s_0 satisfies one of (3.11), i) or ii). Since it is a local maximum, for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $f(s_0 - \epsilon) > 0$ and $f(s_0 + \epsilon) < 0$, which implies $s_0 = (-d + d\sqrt{1 + 4\beta/(4c - d^2)})/4$ or $s_0 = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$. Assume that $s_0 = (-d + d\sqrt{1 + 4\beta/(4c - d^2)})/4$, then $d^2 > 4\beta + 4c$ since otherwise s_0 is not negative. Then $f(s_0) := P_{s_0} \pm \sqrt{P_{s_0}^2 - Q_{s_0}} - s_0^2 < 0$ and we have a contradiction to Proposition 3.7. Hence, $s_0 = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$. The proof of the local minimum points is similar.

i) Assume $\beta < 4c$ then by Lemma 3.4 it follows that $d_2 > 2\sqrt{\beta}$. Hence by Proposition 3.15 there is a gap if and only if $d > 2\sqrt{\beta}$. The point ω is a local maximum not on the imaginary axis if and only if $\omega_\Im = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$ and $P_{\omega_\Im} - \omega_\Im^2 \leqslant 0$. The condition $P_{\omega_\Im} - \omega_\Im^2 \leqslant 0$ holds if and only if $d \geqslant \frac{\beta+4c}{2\sqrt{c}}$. For the local minimum the same idea is used.

ii) Assume $\beta \geqslant 4c$ then by Lemma 3.4, $d_2 \leqslant 2\sqrt{\beta}$. Hence Proposition 3.15 implies that there is a gap if and only if $d > d_2$. The point ω is a local maximum not on the imaginary axis if and only if $\omega_\Im = (-d - \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$ and $P_{\omega_\Im} - \omega_\Im^2 > 0$, which never holds. For the local minimum the same idea is used for $\omega_\Im = (-d + \sqrt{d^2 - 4\beta})/4$ and then it follows that $P_{\omega_\Im} - \omega_\Im^2 > 0$ holds if and only if $c > 0$ and $d > \frac{\beta+4c}{2\sqrt{c}}$. □



FIGURE 4. The set $\gamma_\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, where red denotes points given by $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ and blue $\alpha \in [-\infty, 0)$. The figure describes how γ_β, changes with increasing d. In picture **a** there is no strip. In picture **b** there is a strip and the minimum is moving to the imaginary axis. In **c** the local maximum is moved to the imaginary axis.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $\hat{d} = 0$ if $c = 0$, else $\hat{d}$ is the unique root of*

$$cd^3 + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{16} - \beta c - 3c^2\right) d^2 + c^2(2\beta + 3c)d - c^3(\beta + c) = 0, \tag{3.13}$$

that satisfies $0 < \hat{d} < c$. If $d < 2\sqrt{\hat{d}}$, then the global minimum points of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ are not on the imaginary axis and the imaginary part of the minimum points is

$$\frac{1}{4}\left(-d - d\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\beta}{4c - d^2}}\right), \tag{3.14}$$

else the global minimum point is $i\mu_1$ as defined in (3.12).

Proof. From Proposition 3.5, Lemma 3.10, and Corollary 3.9 it follows that ω with imaginary part (3.14) and $i\mu_1$ are the only possible global minimums. Moreover if the minimum is not on the imaginary axis then $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ since otherwise $\omega_{\Im} < Im(\delta_2)$ does not hold. It thus follows that if $c = 0$ the minimum is $i\mu$. Assume $c > 0$, then ω is a minimum not on the imaginary axis if and only if $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ and by Proposition 3.7, $P_{\omega_\Im} - \omega_\Im^2 > 0$. This holds if and only if $d < 2\sqrt{\hat{d}}$, where $\hat{d}$ is the unique solution to (3.13) satisfying $0 < \hat{d} < c$. Else the minimum must be on the imaginary axis and thus $i\mu_1$. □

In Figure 4 **b** the local minimum is clearly not on the imaginary axis but by increasing d, Figure 4 **c** is obtained, where the local maximum point is on the imaginary axis.

In the following we study the dependence of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ on the parameter d and denote for fixed $d > 0$ this set by $\overline{\gamma_\beta(d) \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$.

Proposition 3.18. *The extreme points of $\overline{\gamma_\beta(d) \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ are continuous in d and the global minimum is decreasing with d. Furthermore, if a strip $\mathcal{S}$ as defined in* (3.10) *exists, then s_0 is strictly decreasing and s_1 is strictly increasing with respect to d.*

Proof. Propositions 3.16, 3.17, and 3.7 yields the continuity of the extreme points. Hence, it is enough to show the results for the extreme points on and off the imaginary axis separately. For each extreme point on $\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}$, the result follows directly from Propositions 3.16 and 3.17. All other extreme points can be written

in the form $\omega = i\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ where μ is a solution to (3.5) and the minimum is then μ_1 as defined in (3.12). Let $q_\beta^d(\mu)$ denote the polynomial (3.5) for a given $d > 0$ and take $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$q_\beta^{d+\epsilon}(\mu) = q_\beta^d(\mu) + 2\mu\left(\mu^2 + d\mu + c + \frac{\beta}{4}\right)\epsilon + \epsilon^2\mu^2. \tag{3.15}$$

Let μ_i^d for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ denote the real roots of q_β^d ordered non-decreasingly. If the minimum is on the imaginary axis then it is given by μ_1^d and Proposition 3.5 implies $(\mu_1^d)^2 + d\mu_1^d + c + \beta/4 > 0$. Thus for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough $q_\beta^{d+\epsilon}(\mu_1^d) < 0$ and (3.15) implies that the minimum of $\overline{\gamma_\beta(d)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is decreasing in d.

Assume a strip $\mathcal{S}$ exists and that the local maximum (minimum) point is_0 (is_1) is on the imaginary axis. Then Proposition 3.16 implies $s_0 = \mu_2^d$ ($s_1 = \mu_3^d$) and we conclude that $q_\beta^d(\mu) > 0$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular the maximum (minimum) is decreasing (inreasing) if and only if for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough $q_\beta^{d+\epsilon}(\mu_2^d) > 0$ ($q_\beta^{d+\epsilon}(\mu_3^d) > 0$). In general, $q_\beta^{d+\epsilon}(\mu) > 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough if and only if $\mu^2 + d\mu + c + \beta/4 \leqslant 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\mu \in \left[-\frac{d}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{d^2-\beta}{4} - c}, -\frac{d}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{d^2-\beta}{4} - c}\right] := I^d.$$

Hence, what remains is to show that all local extreme points μ_2^d, μ_3^d are in I^d. It can be seen that if $\mu_2^{\tilde{d}}, \mu_3^{\tilde{d}} \in I^{\tilde{d}}$, then $\mu_2^d, \mu_3^d \in I^d$ for all $d \geqslant \tilde{d}$.

If $\beta < 4c$ then by Proposition 3.16 i), only the local maximum can be on the imaginary axis. Moreover, the condition $d \geqslant d_0 := (\beta + 4c)/(2\sqrt{c})$ holds, which together with $\mu_2^{d_0} = -\sqrt{c} \in I^{d_0}$ yields the result.

If $\beta > 4c$, there is a strip if and only if $d > d_2$, further $\mu_2^{d_2} = \mu_3^{d_2}$. Thus it is enough to show $\mu_2^{d_2} \in I^{d_2}$ to prove the clame. Since $\beta > 4c$, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $d_2 \leqslant 2\sqrt{\beta} < d_0$. Hence, for $d_0 - d_2 \geqslant \epsilon > 0$ the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta(d_2+\epsilon)\backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has both the local minimum and maximum on the the imaginary axis. But then for some $d \in (d_2, d_0)$ either μ_2^d is decreasing or μ_3^d is increasing. Hence either $\mu_2^d \in I^d$ or $\mu_3^d \in I^d$. Since this holds for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$, $\mu_2^{d_2} = \mu_3^{d_2} \in I^{d_2}$.

For $\beta = 4c$, the result follows immediately since the roots of (3.5) are continuous in β and Proposition 3.16. □

3.2. **Variation of the numerical range $W(B)$.** In this section, we describe the subset of γ obtained when fixing α and varying $\beta \in W(B)$. Define the subsets $\gamma_{\alpha,W(B)}$ and γ_α as

$$\gamma_{\alpha,W(B)} := \bigcup_{n=1}^{4} r_n(\alpha, W(B)), \quad \gamma_\alpha := \gamma_{\alpha,[0,\infty]}. \tag{3.16}$$

For $\alpha = 0$ this is completely solved in Lemma 2.15, therefore assume that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$.

Remark 3.19. In the definition of γ_α, we set $W(B) = [0, \infty]$ since $[0, \infty]$ is the smallest closed interval containing $W(B)$ for all bounded B. The limit of the roots $r_n(\alpha, \beta)$ are 0 and $\pm\infty - id/2$ as $\beta \to \infty$. These the points are in γ_α but for $\alpha \neq 0$ not in $\gamma_{\alpha,W(B)}$.

For $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(i\mathbb{R} \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-\})$, $\omega \in \gamma_\beta$ is equivalent to $\omega \in \Pi_\beta$ as defined in (2.15), and $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}(\omega)$ in equation (2.12). The following results for this curve are similar to



FIGURE 5. Examples of the set $\gamma_\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ that visualize how the set depends on the sign of α. In picture **a**, $\alpha > 0$, in picture **b**, $\alpha = 0$ and in picture **c**, $\alpha < 0$.

the results for γ_β, but the behavior will greatly depend on the sign of α as can be seen in Proposition 2.7 and in Figure 5.

Proposition 3.20. *For $\alpha, c \neq 0$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{-2c/d\}$, $i\nu \in \overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\alpha > 0$ and $\nu = 0$, or ν is a solution to*

$$q_\alpha(\nu) := \nu^4 + \frac{d}{2}\nu^3 - \frac{\alpha d}{2}\nu - \alpha c = 0, \quad \nu \leqslant -\frac{2c}{d}, \tag{3.17}$$

where the inequality is strict if $\alpha < -c$. If $c = 0$, the same result holds except that $0 \neq \overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. The proof follows the same steps as in Proposition 3.2, with the additional condition $\beta \geqslant 0$, which by Corollary 2.7 iii) simplifies to $\nu \leqslant -\frac{2c}{d}$ or $\nu = 0$. □

Corollary 3.21. *The polynomial (2.3) has a root $i\nu$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ of multiplicity $n > 1$ for some $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ if and only if $\nu \leqslant -2c/d$ and ν is a root of (3.17) of multiplicity $n - 1$.*

Proof. Similar to Corollary 3.3, with the additional condition $\beta \geqslant 0$. □

Let Δ_{q_α} denote the discriminant of q_α.

Lemma 3.22. *Let d_0 denote the largest real d solving $\Delta_{q_\alpha} = 0$. Unless $c = 0$ and $\alpha < 0$, d_0 is the unique positive root, else $d_0 = 0$.*

i) *If $\alpha > 0$ then $d_0 \in [4\sqrt{\max(\alpha, c)}, \infty)$ and the polynomial q_α has four real roots if $d \geqslant d_0$, else two.*
ii) *If $\alpha < 0$ the polynomial q_α has two real roots if $d \geqslant d_0$, else zero. If $c > 0$ then $d_0 \in (0, 2\sqrt{c}]$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{d} := d^2/4$ and study $f(\hat{d}) := \Delta_{q_\alpha}$ as a polynomial in $\hat{d}$. By definition of the discriminant:

$$f(\hat{d}) = 4\alpha^3\hat{d}^3 - \alpha^2(27\alpha^2 - 6\alpha c + 27c^2)\hat{d}^2 + 192\alpha^3c^2\hat{d} - 256\alpha^3c^3. \tag{3.18}$$

For $c = 0$ the roots are 0, $27\alpha/4$ and the result follows. If $c > 0$ the discriminant of f is $\Delta_f = -2 \cdot 6^9\alpha^9c^3(\alpha - c)^4(\alpha + c)^2$.

i) Assume $\alpha > 0$ then $\Delta_f \leqslant 0$ with equality only if $c = \alpha$. In that case $\hat{d} = 4c$ is a triple root of f, else $\Delta_f < 0$ and then there is one real root. Hence, there is in each case exactly one real solution to $f(\hat{d}) = 0$. Denote this solution $\hat{d}_0$ and define $d_0 = 2\sqrt{\hat{d}_0}$. Then d_0 is the unique positive solution to $\Delta_{q_\alpha} = 0$. Further since

$f(4\alpha), f(4c) \leqslant 0$ and $f(\hat{d}) \to \infty, \hat{d} \to \infty$ it follows that the unique positive solution $\hat{d}_0 \in [4\max(\alpha, c), \infty)$. If $\hat{d} < \hat{d}_0$ then $f(\hat{d}) < 0$ and thus there are two real roots of q_α. If $\hat{d} \geqslant \hat{d}_0$ then $f(\hat{d}) \leqslant 0$ and since $q_\alpha(0) \leqslant 0$ there is always one root and thus it must be four.

ii) Assume $\alpha < 0$, then there are always three real roots since $\Delta_f \geqslant 0$. From $f(-8c) \leqslant 0$, $f(0) > 0$ and $f(\hat{d}) \to \infty, \hat{d} \to -\infty$, exactly one is positive. Since $f(c) \leqslant 0$ the unique solution $\hat{d}$ is in $(0, c]$. Assume $d < d_0$, then by continuity there is no roots since q_α has no real root for $d = 0$ and $\Delta_{q_\alpha} > 0$ for $d < d_0$. Assume $\hat{d} \geqslant \hat{d}_0$, then $f(\hat{d}) \leqslant 0$ and thus there is two roots of q_α. □

Proposition 3.23. *Let d_0 denote the largest real d solving $\Delta_{q_\alpha} = 0$. Then the set $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersects the imaginary axis in the following points, counting multiplicity:*

i) *If $\alpha > 0$ and $c > 0$, there is one intersection in 0, there are no more intersections if $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ and one more intersection if $2\sqrt{c} \leqslant d < d_0$, else three more intersection. If $\alpha > 0$ and $c = 0$ there is no intersections if $d < d_0$, else two intersections.*
ii) *If $-c \leqslant \alpha < 0$, there is no intersections if $d < 2\sqrt{c}$, else one intersection.*
iii) *If $\alpha < -c$, no intersections if $d < d_0$, two intersections if $d_0 \leqslant d < 2\sqrt{c}$, else one intersection.*

Proof. The intersections of $\overline{\gamma_\beta \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ coincides with the roots of the polynomial (3.17) in Proposition 3.20. In each case Lemma 3.22 is used to obtain the number of real roots.

i) Assume $\alpha > 0$ and $c > 0$, then by Proposition 3.20, there is a simple intersection in 0. For $d < 2\sqrt{c}$ Proposition 3.20 implies that there are no solutions to (3.17). For $d = 2\sqrt{c}$, the point $-2c/d = -d/2$ is a simple root of q_α and by Proposition 3.20, there is a simple intersection of the imaginary axis. For $\nu < -d/2$, $q_\alpha(\nu) > 0$ and hence no more intersections of the imaginary axis. For $d > 2\sqrt{c}$, $q_\alpha(-2c/d) < 0$, thus there is either one or three solutions of (3.17). If $2\sqrt{c} < d < d_0$, there is one intersection. Assume $d \geqslant d_0$. Then $q_\alpha(\nu) < 0$ for $\nu \in (-2c/d, 0)$ and q_α is convex for $\nu \geqslant 0$. Hence, (3.17) has three solutions. Now assume $c = 0$, then Proposition 3.20 shows that zero is a false root and thus in this case there is one less intersection of the imaginary axis.

ii), For $\nu \leqslant -2c/d$ the derivative $q'_\alpha(\nu)$ is non-positive with equality only if $\alpha = c$, thus there is at most one solution to (3.17). If $2\sqrt{c} > d$ then $q_\alpha(-2c/d) > 0$ and there is no solution. For $2\sqrt{c} \leqslant d$, $q_\alpha(-2c/d) \leqslant 0$, hence from Proposition 3.20 and $\alpha \geqslant -c$ it follows that (3.17) has one solution. If $2\sqrt{c} = d$ and $\alpha = -c$, then $-2c/d$ is a double root of (3.5) and by Corollary 3.21 a triple root of $p_{(\alpha,0)}$. From the injectivity stated in Lemma 2.8 iii) follows that there is only one intersection of the imaginary axis at this point. The result then follows from Proposition 3.20.

iii) If $d < d_0$ then there are no real solutions to (3.17). If $d_0 \leqslant d < 2\sqrt{c}$, then $q_\alpha(\nu) > 0$ for $\nu > -d/2$. For $-d/2 \geqslant \nu > -2c/d$ we have

$$q_\alpha(\nu) \geqslant \left(\frac{-2c}{d} + \frac{d}{2}\right)\left(-\frac{d^3}{8} - \frac{\alpha d}{2}\right) - \alpha\left(c - \frac{d^2}{4}\right) = \frac{d^2}{4}\left(c - \frac{d^2}{4}\right) > 0.$$

Thus, the two roots satisfy $\nu \leqslant -2c/d$. Assume $d = 2\sqrt{c}$, then by Proposition 3.17 the value $-2c/d$ is not an intersection of the imaginary axis. However, there is an intersection at the distinct root $\sqrt[3]{\alpha d/2}$, which shows that we have one root. For



FIGURE 6. Examples of the set $\gamma_\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, in **a** and **b**, $\alpha > 0$ and in **c**, $\alpha < 0$.

$d > 2\sqrt{c} > 0$ it follows that $q_\alpha(-2c/d) < 0$ and it can be seen that (3.17) has one solution. □

The multiplicity of a real root $\nu < -2c/d$ of q_α in (3.17) will determine the number of segments of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ intersecting $i\nu$. However, this will in general not hold if $-2c/d$ is a root of q_α. This case is however addressed in Proposition 3.23. Figure 6 **b**, shows an example where $-2c/d = 2$ is an intersection of the imaginary axis, while in Figure 6 **c**, $-2c/d = 2$ is not an intersection despite being a root of q_α. Cases with different number of intersections are illustrated in Figure 5 and in Figure 6.

Proposition 3.24. *Assume $c > 0$ then $\omega \in \overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\omega = \infty - d/2$ (in the limit $\omega_\Im = -d/2$), $\omega = \delta_\pm$ (only if $d \leqslant 2\sqrt{c}$ which is strict if $\alpha < -c$) or $\omega \in \Pi_\beta \backslash \{\mathbb{R} - id/2\}$ and one of the following four identities hold:*

$$\omega_\Re = \pm\sqrt{R_{\omega_\Im} \pm \sqrt{R_{\omega_\Im}^2 - S_{\omega_\Im}} - \omega_\Im^2}, \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$R_{\omega_\Im} = \tfrac{\alpha d}{2(d+2\omega_\Im)}, \quad S_{\omega_\Im} = -\tfrac{2\alpha c \omega_\Im}{d+2\omega_\Im} \ . \tag{3.20}$$

If $c = 0$ then $0 \notin \overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ but all other statements hold as for the case $c > 0$.

Proof. Similar to Proposition 3.7 subject to $\beta \geqslant 0$. □

Remark 3.25. Since in the limit $\beta \to \infty$ the roots $r_n(\alpha, \beta)$ approaches 0 and $\pm\infty - id/2$, it is convenient to assume the imaginary part in infinity is $-d/2$. Using this convention, for $\alpha > 0$ the global maximum is 0 and the global minimum is $-d/2$. For $\alpha < 0$ the global maximum is $-d/2$.

Lemma 3.26. *A point $\omega \in \gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}$, with $\omega_\Im \notin \{0, -d/2\}$ is an extreme point in the sense of Definition 3.8 if and only if it is a distinct root to $g(\omega_\Im) := (d + 2\omega_\Im)^2(R_{\omega_\Im}^2 - S_{\omega_\Im})$. The roots of g are*

$$\omega_\Im = \frac{-d \pm d\sqrt{1 - \frac{\alpha}{c}}}{4}. \tag{3.21}$$

A double root of g is only possible if $\alpha = c > d^2/16$, where $\omega = \pm\sqrt{c - d^2/16} - id/2$. Then, ω is a self-intersection of $\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.10. □

An example of a self-intersection of $\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}$ can be seen in Figure 6 **b**.

Lemma 3.27. *A point $i\nu \in i\mathbb{R}$ where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{-d/2, 0\}$ is an extreme point to $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $0 = R_\nu + \sqrt{R_\nu^2 - S_\nu} - \nu^2$ and ν is a distinct intersection of the imaginary axis.*

Proof. The condition $R_\nu + \sqrt{R_\nu^2 - S_\nu} - \nu^2 = 0$ implies $R_\nu > 0$. Hence $\nu > -d/2$ for $\alpha > 0$ and $\nu < -d/2$ for $\alpha < 0$. Then it follows from Proposition 2.7 iv) that the points (3.21) are obtained for positive β. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.11. □

Lemma 3.28. *For any $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ each bounded closed curve component of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ either contains or encloses at least one root to* (2.3).

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.28 with the exception that any bounded component is not necessarily closed. □

Proposition 3.29. *If $\alpha > 0$ there is exactly one strip if $\alpha < c$ or $d > d_0$, else there is no strip.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.15, using Proposition 3.24 and Lemmata 3.26, 3.27 and 3.28. □

In the following we study the dependence of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ on the parameter d and denote for fixed $d > 0$ this set by $\overline{\gamma_\alpha(d) \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$. The mapping $d \mapsto \gamma_\alpha(d)$ is a continuous deformation since γ_α is given by roots of polynomials. Moreover, by Lemma 3.28 and that the number of roots of (3.17) is finite it follows that $\overline{\gamma_\alpha(d) \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is a continuous deformation, except in the case $d = 2\sqrt{c}$ and $\alpha < -c$ at $\nu = -d/2$.

Definition 3.30. Denote the real solutions to (3.17) as

$$\nu_1 < \nu_2 < \dots \tag{3.22}$$

Proposition 3.31. *The extreme points of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ have the following properties:*

i) *If $\alpha \geqslant c$ the set $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ has a strip $\mathcal{S}$* (3.10) *if and only if $d > d_0$. The local maximum point is $i\nu_1$ and the local minimum is $i\nu_2$.*

ii) *If $c > \alpha > 0$ there is a strip $\mathcal{S}$.*
   - *If* (3.23) i) holds then the local maximum points are not on the imaginary axis and $s_0 = (-d - d\sqrt{1 - \alpha/c})/4$. Else the local maximum point is $i\nu_1$.
   - If (3.23) ii) holds then the local minimum points are not on the imaginary axis and $s_1 = (-d + d\sqrt{1 - \alpha/c})/4$. Else the local minimum point is $i\nu_2$.

iii) *If $\alpha < 0$, the global minimum points, ω, are not on the imaginary axis if* (3.23) i) holds and $\omega_\Im = (-d - d\sqrt{1 + \alpha/c})/4$. Else the global minimum point is $i\nu_1$. If $c = 0$ the global minimum point is always $i\nu_1$.

$$\text{i)} \quad d < \frac{4\sqrt{c}}{\sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\alpha}{c}}}}, \qquad \text{ii)} \quad d < \frac{4\sqrt{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\alpha}{c}}}} \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to Proposition 3.16. □

Proposition 3.32. *The extreme points are continuous in d.*

i) *If $\alpha > c$ and a strip $\mathcal{S}$ (3.10) exists, then the local minimum of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is increasing in d, and the local maximum is decreasing in d.*
ii) *If $c = \alpha > 0$ and a strip $\mathcal{S}$ exists, then the local minimum of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is $-i\sqrt{c}$, and the local maximum is $-id/4 - i\sqrt{d^2/16 - c}$.*
iii) *If $c > \alpha > 0$ then the local extreme points of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is decreasing in d.*
iv) *For $\alpha < 0$ the global minimum of $\overline{\gamma_\alpha \backslash i\mathbb{R}}$ is decreasing in d.*

Proof. The continuity in d of the extreme points follows from Propositions 3.31 and 3.24.

i)-iii) Assume that a strip $\mathcal{S}$ exists. If an extreme point is located not on the imaginary axis then $\alpha < c$ by Lemma 3.26 and then the result follows from (3.21). Thus it sufficient to show the result for the roots of (3.17) and for the case $\alpha = c$ it follows directly. Hence, assume that $\alpha \neq c$. Similarly as in Proposition 3.18, observe the polynomial shifted by some small $\epsilon > 0$ is

$$q_\alpha^{d+\epsilon}(\nu) := q_\alpha^d(\nu) + \frac{\nu}{2}(\nu^2 - \alpha)\epsilon. \tag{3.24}$$

For $\alpha > 0$ with a strip it follows from Proposition 3.29 that $d \geqslant d_0$ since otherwise the minimum and maximum is not on the imaginary axis, and thus there are three roots. The local maximum is $i\nu_1$ and the local minimum is $i\nu_2$ by Proposition 3.31. The local maximum (minimum) is decreasing (increasing) if and only if, $q_\alpha^{d+\epsilon}(\nu_1^d) < 0$ ($q_\alpha^{d+\epsilon}(\nu_2^d) < 0$), for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. In general, if $q_\alpha^d(\nu) = 0$, then $q_\alpha^{d+\epsilon}(\nu) > 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough if and only if $(\nu^2 - \alpha) > 0$, and thus $\nu < -\sqrt{\alpha}$. Hence, what to be shown is wether $\nu_1^d, \nu_2^d < -\sqrt{\alpha}$. Since $q_\alpha(-\sqrt{\alpha}) = \alpha(\alpha - c)$, there is an even number of roots in $(-\infty, -\sqrt{\alpha}]$ if $\alpha > c$ and an odd number of roots $(-\infty, -\sqrt{\alpha}]$ if $\alpha < c$. The polynomial $q_\alpha^d(\nu)$ is concave only on the interval $[-d/4, 0]$, hence there can at most be two roots in this interval. From Lemma 3.22 and that $d \geqslant d_0$ it follows that $-d/4 \leqslant -\sqrt{\alpha}$ and thus there has to be at least one root in the interval $(-\infty, -d/4]$. Hence, if $\alpha > c$ there are two roots in $(-\infty, -\sqrt{\alpha}]$, thus $\nu_1^d, \nu_2^d < -\sqrt{\alpha}$, this proves i).

If $\alpha < c$ it follows that $q'_\alpha(-\sqrt{\alpha})$ and $q'_\alpha(-d/4)$ are positive and since q_α is concave on $[-d/4, -\sqrt{\alpha}]$ there is at most one root in that interval. On $(-\infty, -d/4]$, q_α is convex and since $q_\alpha(-d/4) < 0$ it follows that q_α has exactly one root in this interval. Since the number of roots is odd in $(-\infty, -\sqrt{\alpha}]$ it follows that there is only one root in the interval, this proves iii).

iv) The result follows from Lemma 3.26 if the minimum is not on the imaginary axis. Assume $\alpha < 0$ and that the minimum is on the imaginary axis. Then the minimum will be $i\nu_1^d$, which implies $((\nu_1^d)^2 - \alpha) > 0$ and thus the minimum is decreasing, due to (3.24). □

4. Resolvent approximation

In this section, we assume $\epsilon > 0$. The ϵ-pseudospectrum $\sigma^\epsilon(T)$ is the union of $\sigma(T)$ and the set of all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\|T^{-1}(\omega)\| > \epsilon^{-1}$. An equivalent condition for $\omega \in \sigma^\epsilon(T)$ is that there exist a function $u \in \operatorname{dom} T$, $\|u\| = 1$ for which $\|T(\omega)u\| < \epsilon$. Such u is called an approximate eigenvector or ϵ-pseudomode [Dav07, p. 255]. To be able to see how well-behaved T^{-1} is close to $W_a(T)$ as defined in (2.6) we will make an upper estimate of the resolvent for the rational function (1.1).

Definition 4.1. Denote the ϵ-pseudonumerical range as the set

$$W^\epsilon(T) = W(T) \cup \{\omega \in \mathcal{C} \backslash W(T) : \exists u \in \operatorname{dom} T, |(T(\omega)u, u)|/\|u\|^2 < \epsilon\}.$$



FIGURE 7. The figures visualize $W_a(T)$ in red and blue and $W_a^1(T)$ in grey. In the Figures $c = 6$ and $d = 4$. For **a**, $W(A) = [1, \infty]$, $W(B) = [0, 11]$ and for **b**, $W(A) = [-\infty, \infty]$, $W(B) = [4, 11]$.

From definition 4.1 it is clear that $W^\epsilon(T) \supset W(T)$. Moreover, $\|T(\omega)u\|\|u\| \geqslant |(T(\omega)u, u)|$ for $u \in \operatorname{dom} T$ yields that $W^\epsilon(T)\backslash\sigma(T) \supset \sigma^\epsilon(T)\backslash\sigma(T)$. Similar to the enclosure of $W(T)$, (2.6), define an enclosure of $W^\epsilon(T) \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ as

$$W_a^\epsilon(T) := W_a(T) \cup \{\omega \in \mathcal{C}\backslash W_a(T) : \exists(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega, |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| < \epsilon\}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)$ is given in (2.2).

Remark 4.2. For $\omega \in \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \infty\}$, $\omega \in W_a(T)$ if and only if $\omega \in W_a^\epsilon(T)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Figure 7 illustrates $W_a(T)$ and $W_a^\epsilon(T)$ in two cases. Note in particular that the distance between a point $\omega \in \partial W_a^\epsilon(T)$ and $\partial W_a(T)$ is not constant.

Define the set,

$$\gamma^\epsilon := \overline{\partial\Gamma^\epsilon\backslash W_a(T)}, \quad \Gamma^\epsilon := \{\omega \in \mathcal{C}\backslash\gamma : \exists(\alpha, \beta) \in \partial\Omega, |t(\omega)| < \epsilon\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Theorem 4.3. $\partial W_a^\epsilon(T) = \gamma^\epsilon$.

Proof. Assume that $\omega \notin \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \infty\}$. If $\omega \in \partial W_a^\epsilon(T)$, then $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \epsilon$ by continuity. Conversely assume $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \epsilon$ and let (α_0, β_0) be such that $|t_{(\alpha_0,\beta_0)}(\omega)| = \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ and $t_{(\alpha_0,\beta_0)}$ is non-constant and holomorphic the minimum modulus principle states that for each neighborhood N of ω, there is a $\omega' \in N$ such that $|t_{(\alpha_0,\beta_0)}(\omega')| < \epsilon$. Hence, $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega')| < \epsilon$ and thus $\omega \in \partial W_a^\epsilon(T)$ is equivalent to $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \epsilon$.

Assume $\omega \notin W_a(T)$, then it follows that $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| > 0$. Since $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)$ is linear in α and β and nonzero it follows that $|t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)|$ attain its minimum for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \partial\Omega$. Hence $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\partial\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \epsilon$ and thus $\omega \in \partial W_a^\epsilon(T)$. It then follows that $\partial W_a^\epsilon(T)\backslash\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \infty\} = \gamma^\epsilon\backslash\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \infty\}$.

From $W(B) \neq \{0\}$ it follows that $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \infty\}$ will not be isolated points, since $\partial W_a^\epsilon(T)$ and γ^ϵ are closed sets $\partial W_a^\epsilon(T) = \gamma^\epsilon$ follow by continuity. □

Remark 4.4. From the minimum modulus principle it follows that $W_a^\epsilon(T)$ has no new components compared with $W_a(T)$. However, components disconnected in $W_a(T)$ might be connected in $W_a^\epsilon(T)$; see Figure 7 **a**.

Define the complex constants

$$\kappa := \frac{\omega^2}{c - id\omega - \omega^2}, \qquad \lambda := \omega^2. \tag{4.3}$$

From definition (2.2) it follows that the absolute value of $t_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ can be written in the form

$$|t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\kappa_{\Im} \\ 1 & -\kappa_{\Re} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{\Im} \\ \lambda_{\Re} \end{pmatrix} \right\|. \tag{4.4}$$

The following Proposition is proven by a technique similar to the active set algorithm for constrained linear least squares problems presented in [NW06, Chapter 16.5].

Proposition 4.5. *Assume $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ and let κ and λ be defined as in* (4.3). *Then $\omega \in W_a^\epsilon(T)$ if and only if $\epsilon > \epsilon_0$. If $\kappa_{\Re} = 0$ then*

$$\epsilon_0 := \sqrt{\min_{\beta \in W(B)} |\beta\kappa_{\Im} + \lambda_{\Im}|^2 + \min_{\alpha \in W(A)} |\alpha - \lambda_{\Re}|^2}.$$

If $\kappa_{\Re} \neq 0$, let $\mathcal{B} := \left[\frac{W_{\min}(A) - \lambda_{\Re}}{\kappa_{\Re}}, \frac{W_{\max}(A) - \lambda_{\Re}}{\kappa_{\Re}} \right]$ and define the set $\Omega' := \{(W_{\min}(A), \beta_{\min}), (W_{\max}(A), \beta_{\max}), (\alpha_{op}, \beta_{op})\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\min} &= \min_{\beta \in W(B)} \left| \beta + \tfrac{\kappa_{\Im}\lambda_{\Im} - \kappa_{\Re}(W_{\min}(A) - \lambda_{\Re})}{|\kappa|^2} \right|, \\ \beta_{\max} &= \min_{\beta \in W(B)} \left| \beta + \tfrac{\kappa_{\Im}\lambda_{\Im} - \kappa_{\Re}(W_{\max}(A) - \lambda_{\Re})}{|\kappa|^2} \right|, \\ \beta_{op} &= \min_{\beta \in W(B) \cap \mathcal{B}} |\beta\kappa_{\Im} + \lambda_{\Im}|, \quad \alpha_{op} = \beta_{op}\kappa_{\Re} + \lambda_{\Re}, \end{aligned}$$

if $\kappa_{\Im} = 0$ the choice of $\beta_{op} \in \mathcal{B}$ is arbitrary,

$$\epsilon_0 := \min_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Omega'} \sqrt{|\beta\kappa_{\Im} + \lambda_{\Im}|^2 + |\alpha - \kappa_{\Re}\beta - \lambda_{\Re}|^2}.$$

Proof. $\omega \in W_a^\epsilon(T)$ if and only if $\epsilon > \min_{(\alpha,\beta)} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| =: \epsilon_0$. In the sense of (4.4), this is a constrained linear least squares optimization problem. If $\kappa_{\Re} = 0$ the result is trivial. Otherwise, since the problem is linear the minimizing value α is either on one of the endpoint of $W(A)$ or an α that makes the second equation solvable in $\beta \in W(B)$. Computing the optimal $\beta \in W(B)$ in all of these cases gives three possible pairs in Ω that minimizes (4.4), the result follows. □

Corollary 4.6. *For $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(W_a(T) \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-\})$, $\|T^{-1}(\omega)\| \leqslant 1/\epsilon_0$, where ϵ_0 is given by Proposition 4.5.*

Proof. Assume that $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(W_a(T) \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-\})$, then from Proposition 4.5 it follows that $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| = \epsilon_0 > 0$. Hence, the result follows from $\|T(\omega)u\|/\|u\| \geqslant |(T(\omega)u, u)|/\|u\|^2 \geqslant \min_{(\alpha,\beta)} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)|$. □

Figure 8 illustrates the upper bound of $\|T^{-1}(\omega)\|$ in Corollary 4.6 for a case with a bounded Ω. The red dots in $W_a(T)$ correspond to eigenvalues of a particular matrix function. On the imaginary axis a simpler result than Proposition 4.5 holds.

Proposition 4.7. *Let A^ϵ be an arbitrary selfadjoint operator with $W(A^\epsilon) = [W_{\min}(A) - \epsilon, W_{\max}(A) + \epsilon]$ and define*

$$T^\epsilon(\omega) := A^\epsilon - \omega^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c - id\omega - \omega^2} B$$



FIGURE 8. In the figure $W(A) = [-32, 4]$, $W(B) = [0, 4]$, $c = 4$ and $d = 4$. For $\omega \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(W_a(T) \cup \{\delta_+, \delta_-\})$ the upper bound of $\|T^{-1}(\omega)\|$ from Corollary 4.6 is visualized. For $\omega \in W_a(T)$ the resolvent is computed numerically for particular matrices A and B.

Then $\overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)} \cap i\mathbb{R} = W_a(T^\epsilon) \cap i\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Assume $\omega \in i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_-\}$, then as in proof of Theorem 4.3 we have $\omega \in \overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)}$ if and only if, $\min_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\Omega} |t_{(\alpha,\beta)}(\omega)| \leqslant \epsilon$. Hence, $\omega \in \overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)}$ if and only if

$$\alpha + \omega_\Im^2 + \frac{\omega_\Im^2}{c + d\omega_\Im + \omega_\Im^2}\beta = e \tag{4.5}$$

for some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega$ and some e with $|e| \leqslant \epsilon$. Assume $\omega \in i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_-\}$ satisfies (4.5), then $\alpha - e \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha - e \in W(A^\epsilon)$ and thus $\omega \in W_a(T^\epsilon)$. The converse is obvious. Hence, $\overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)} \cap i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_1\} = W_a(T^\epsilon) \cap i\mathbb{R}\backslash\{\delta_+, \delta_1\}$, which by continuity yields $\overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)} \cap i\mathbb{R} = W_a(T^\epsilon) \cap i\mathbb{R}$. □

The set $\overline{W_a^\epsilon(T)} \cap i\mathbb{R}$ can then be obtained by the algorithm given in Proposition 2.14.

Acknowledgements. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Swedish Research Council under Grant No. 621-2012-3863.

REFERENCES

[AL95] V. M. Adamjan and H. Langer. Spectral properties of a class of rational operator valued functions. *J. Operator Theory*, 33(2):259–277, 1995.

[ALL01] V. Adamjan, H. Langer, and M. Langer. A spectral theory for a λ-rational Sturm-Liouville problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 171(2):315–345, 2001.

[AMP02] M. Adam, J. Maroulas, and P. Psarrakos. On the numerical range of rational matrix functions. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 50(1):75–89, 2002.

[APT02] V. Adamjan, V. Pivovarchik, and C. Tretter. On a class of non-self-adjoint quadratic matrix operator pencils arising in elasticity theory. *J. Operator Theory*, 47(2):325–341, 2002.

[Bro12] L. E. J. Brouwer. Zur Invarianz des n-dimensionalen Gebiets. *Math. Ann.*, 72(1):55–56, 1912.

[CNP02] M.-T. Chien, H. Nakazato, and P. Psarrakos. Point equation of the boundary of the numerical range of a matrix polynomial. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 347:205–217, 2002.

[Dav07] E. B. Davies. *Linear operators and their spectra*, volume 106 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[EKE12] C. Effenberger, D. Kressner, and C. Engström. Linearization techniques for band structure calculations in absorbing photonic crystals. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.*, 89(2):180–191, 2012.

[EL04] D. Eschwé and M. Langer. Variational principles for eigenvalues of self-adjoint operator functions. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 49(3):287–321, 2004.

[FM91] M. Faierman and R. Mennicken. An elliptic boundary value problem depending nonlinearly upon the eigenvalue parameter. *Manuscripta Math.*, 73(3):319–333, 1991.

[Lif89] A. E. Lifschitz. *Magnetohydrodynamics and spectral theory*, volume 4 of *Developments in Electromagnetic Theory and Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989.

[LR94] C.-K. Li and L. Rodman. Numerical range of matrix polynomials. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 15(4):1256–1265, 1994.

[MM01] A. Markus and V. Matsaev. Some estimates for the resolvent and for the lengths of Jordan chains of an analytic operator function. In *Recent advances in operator theory (Groningen, 1998)*, volume 124 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 473–479. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.

[NW06] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, second edition, 2006.

[SK86] T. L. Saaty and P. C. Kainen. *The four-color problem*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, second edition, 1986. Assaults and conquest.

[TE05] L. N. Trefethen and M. Embree. *Spectra and pseudospectra*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005. The behavior of nonnormal matrices and operators.

[Tre08] C. Tretter. *Spectral theory of block operator matrices and applications*. Imperial College Press, London, 2008.

[Zio03] R. W. Ziolkowski. Pulsed and CW gaussian beam interactions with double negative metamaterial slabs. *Opt. Express*, 11(7):662–681, Apr 2003.

Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

E-mail address: christian.engstrom@math.umu.se

Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

E-mail address: axel.torshage@math.umu.se

This figure "pseudo.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arxiv.org/ps/1604.07586v1